DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 774 UD 020 389

AUTHOR Anderson, Alan B.; Stasiulis, Daiva K.
TITLE Canadian Multiculturalism: A Critique.
PUB DATE Oct 79
NOTE 54p.; Paper presented at the Confe... on "Ethnicity, Power and Politics in Canada," the Biennial Conference of the Canadian Ethnic Studies Association (Vancouver, Canada, October 11-13, 1979). References may be marginally legible. Not available in paper copy due to reproducibility factors.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Differences; *Cultural Pluralism; Ethnic Groups; *Ethnicity; Foreign Countries; *Group Unity; Immigrants; *Public Policy
IDENTIFIERS *Canada

ABSTRACT

This paper attempts to assess the extent to which multiculturalism in Canada is fact (sociological reality), fancy (ideology), or policy. First, the actual observability of separate ethnic groups is considered. Some factors in the persistence of cultural identity are discussed. These include ethnic visibility, replenishment through continued immigration, institutional completeness and enclosure of ethnic minorities, a group's position in the capitalist socioeconomic structure, and the role of the Anglo-French bilingual bicultural framework in emphasizing general ethnic diversity. Census data on language and religion are examined as indicators of erosion of ethnicity, at least among Euro-Canadian groups. Second, multiculturalism is explored as an ideology in Canadian society. Factors considered include the flexibility and manipulability of individuals' ethnic identities, and overemphasis on ethnicity, especially in social science literature, and the romanticization of ethnic identity and ethnic history. Finally, multiculturalism is examined from the policy perspective. Recent Federal, Provincial, and municipal policies are mentioned and the public funding of ethnic events and multicultural activities is emphasized as an important perpetuator of ethnic diversity. Critiques of current multicultural policies, including the leftist view that "multiculturalism" actually represents the interests of the dominant society, are reviewed. Future directions in multicultural policy are also considered. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MAR 3 - 1980

ED187774

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CANADIAN MULTICULTURALISM:

A CRITIQUE

Alan B. Anderson
Department of Sociology
University of Saskatchewan

-and-

Daiva K. Stasiulis
Department of Sociology
University of Toronto

Paper presented at the Conference on "Ethnicity, Power and Politics in Canada", the Biennial Conference of the Canadian Ethnic Studies Association, Vancouver, October 11-13, 1979.

UD020389

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Alan B. Anderson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PREFACE

This paper was originally conceived as an elaboration from a couple of radio talks on multiculturalism by A. B. Anderson, "Myths of Multiculturalism", broadcast in the Voices series on CJUS-FM, Saskatoon, December 14, 1976, and "Multiculturalism: Myth, Reality, and Policy", broadcast in the Mosaic series on that same station, November 1, 1977. D. K. Stasiulis collaborated in writing much of the third part of the paper, on multiculturalism as policy; this discussion is primarily a revision and abridgment of her earlier paper, "The Representation and Regulation of Ethnic Group Interests Within the Canadian State", presented at the annual meetings of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, held at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, June 1-4, 1979. Throughout the present paper the authors are indebted to the discussion of ethnic diversity and multiculturalism by a number of sociologists, particularly Jean Burnet (1975, 1978, 1979), Wsevolod W. Isajiw (1975, 1978), and Raymond Breton (1974, 1978).

The term "multiculturalism" is relatively novel in social science literature, perhaps even more recent an invention than the term "ethnicity" (Burnet 1975: 1). In fact, multiculturalism has not been declared an official federal policy in Canada until the present decade, when it took precedence over the longstanding Canadian emphasis on biculturalism (a term presumably first used in the 1920s). Yet this is not to suggest, of course, that multiculturalism as a sociological phenomenon or even as a policy is new to the Canadian scene.

"Multiculturalism" is a rather awkward term in a number of respects (Burnet 1975: 13-16). In view of the actual situation of Canadian ethnic minorities (nationally every ethnic group in Canada is a minority), and considering the intended government policies affecting ethnic minorities, a different term might have seemed more appropriate to use, such as ethnic diversity, ethnic pluralism, multi-ethnic, poly-ethnic, or some such term as used in other ethnically complex societies. However, the term "ethnic", alone or accompanied by its prefixes and suffixes, may have implied a somewhat derogatory status, at least in the minds of some Canadians during the sixties. Members of the two Canadian "charter groups" (as they were fond of calling themselves), the Anglos and the French, did not appreciate being equated with the "ethnics", who included recent immigrants, the so-called "New Canadians", D.P.s and the like. Moreover, these charter Canadians and other Canadians were becoming loath to proclaim their ethnic identity; ethnicity was for new arrivals who were not yet fully integrated into Canadian society, i.e. who were not yet true Canadians. However, frequent use of the term "ethnic", and perhaps increasing disapproval of the term "culture", in the most recent social science literature would seem

to add to recognition of "multiculturalism" as an awkward or misleading term. After all, are we actually referring to the variety of cultures in Canadian society (difficult to define) or to the heterogeneity of the Canadian population?

Isajiw (1975: 1) has appropriately suggested that "one has to distinguish between multiculturalism as an ideology, a social policy, and as a feature of the structure of our society. The three meanings are, of course, interdependent. An analysis of the structure of society may indicate a certain ideology as the most appropriate one to follow. On the other hand, an ideology applied into policy systematically pursued over a longer period of time may contribute to the development of one or another feature of the social structure."

This paper will take yet another general (broad, interdisciplinary), although harder, look at multiculturalism in Canada, attempting to assess the extent to which Canadian multiculturalism is fact (sociological reality), fancy (ideology), or policy.

First the paper will question whether multiculturalism in Canada is in fact empirically observable. Is Canadian society really a "cultural mosaic" compared to an American "melting pot"? Does recent sociological research and research in other disciplines, support this notion? To what extent, and how rapidly, are Canadian ethnic minorities losing their traditional cultures, languages, and religious identifications? Is intermarriage increasingly undermining a cohesive sense of ethnicity?

May (should?) "multiculturalism" (a novel term in social science literature) be viewed as a fanciful retreat or preoccupation of selected (not all) ethnic group members? How is ethnicity perceived by ethnic group members (and for that matter, who exactly is a member??) Do "professional" ethnic

group members (with vested interests in maintaining ethnic group solidarity) tend to romanticize their ethnic history, and to perpetuate certain myths of "multiculturalism" (loosely defined)?

Having at least raised these pertinent questions, the paper will then relate the foregoing discussion to implications for policy, thereby providing a succinct critique of governmental policies affecting multiculturalism at the federal, provincial, and local levels. To what extent is multiculturalism likely to succeed with any longevity unless governments encourage it actively in meaningful ways? Not simply through sponsoring folk crafts, festivals, and academic conferences, but more through financing "alternative" education for ethnic and religious minorities, multilingualism, the writing of good ethnic histories, etc. What have been the main directions of government spending on multiculturalism in recent years? If Canada at a regional level is actually unicultural, bicultural, or multicultural (i.e. depending on the region), should policies not take this into consideration? What would seem to account for the fact that Canadian policies have continously been in flux between attempted anglo-conformity, racism, biculturalism, token multiculturalism, pan-Canadian nationalism, ethnic (specifically Québecois) separatism?

1. MULTICULTURALISM AS FACT/REALITY

A. The Question of a Cultural Mosaic

Our initial question must be whether multiculturalism in Canada is in fact empirically observable, whether recent research in sociology and related disciplines supports the notion of Canadian society as a "cultural mosaic". One doesn't have to look very far to find ample evidence of multiculturalism in Canada. This year hundreds of thousands of Canadians are attending the "gathering of the clans" in Nova Scotia and other ethnic gatherings across

Canada, including Caribana and Caravan in Toronto, Mosaic in Regina, Folklorama in Winnipeg, Summer Frolics in Saskatoon, a Greek festival in Vancouver, an Icelandic one -- not to forget the "Frog Follies" in a French community -- in Manitoba, to mention but a few ....

Indeed, the notion of a Canadian mosaic is hardly new. As Burnet (1979: 2-3) has written, "It is true that from the 1920s on .... there was much talk of the Canadian mosaic. Speakers and writers indefatigably praised the situation in which ethnic groups could retain their distinctiveness and yet be Canadian, in contrast to the American melting pot as they conceived it. They vied with each other in proposing visual and gustatory metaphors, such as flower garden, salad and stew, for the Canadian situation. In 1965 John Porter could say that the mosaic was the country's most cherished value."

During the seventies there remained many prominent advocates of a mosaic supported by federal policy. At the first Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, held in Ottawa in October, 1973, Stanley Haidasz, the first and only (short-lived) Canadian minister of state for multiculturalism, commented (Toronto Star, October 20, 1973) that "multiculturalism is here to stay .... because it is an essential element in the government determination to promote unity and protect national identity"; while George Ignatieff repeated the often-heard warning that Canadians will lose their identity to Americanization unless ethnic groups preserve their cultural heritage. (There is relatively little evidence, incidentally, to support the notion that the United States is a melting pot while Canada is a mosaic.) Haidasz was not concerned about the perils of creating or maintaining a hyphenated Canadianism, commenting that "we are first and foremost Canadians and multiculturalism is really a policy for all Canadians." He asserted that a flexible universal multicultural policy can serve to break down prejudices

that Canadians might have toward ethnic minorities, thus Canada will become more — not less — unified. Senator Paul Yuzyk (1975: 5) has waxed even more eloquent on the subject:

> Present-day Canada is a pluralistic society, a country of numerous minorities with two dominant cultures. During the past one hundred years she has been gradually evolving into a multicultural nation. The concept of a "bilingual, multicultural Canadian nation" is realistic and the very essence of a dynamic Canadianism. It is fortunate that Canadian governments have rejected the "melting pot" theory with its colorless uniformity and have promoted a "mosaic-type" of Canadian culture based on the voluntary integration of the best elements of the cultures of the component ethnic groups. The development of a composite Canadian culture, rich in variety, beauty and harmony, reflects the principle of "unity in continuing diversity" and the democratic spirit of compromise inherent in the Canadian Confederation.

At a recent Ukrainian fund-raising dinner in Saskatoon one speaker told the audience that "Canada's unique characteristic and strength is multiculturalism", but that "a government cannot create a multicultural society by legislation. Only the people can do it." He said that "Canadians have abandoned the futile evangelism of patriotic nationalism. Instead, every Canadian can enjoy the joy and pride of his cultural roots, recognized, respected and accepted as a worthwhile contribution to Canadian society." (Saskatoon Star Phoenix, October 23, 1978).

If there are strong advocates of multiculturalism, there are also more cautious spokesmen for ethnic associations. For example, at the 1973 Ottawa Conference Robert Kadoguchi, then executive-director of the Japanese-Canadian Cultural Centre in Toronto, cautioned that there is a danger in stressing ethnicity too much, lest ethnic group members neglect to regard themselves as Canadians first. At the very least, opinion varies, even among ethnic minority spokesmen, as to how much ethnicity should be stressed.

Moreover, an elementary consideration, too often overlooked in generalizations about Canada as a whole, is that the extent of ethnic diversity

varies greatly from region to region. Given the proportions which people of British, French, native, or other origins form of the regional population, it seems likely that Anglo-conformity will prevail in the Atlantic provinces (with the possible exception of New Brunswick, which still has a British-origin majority but a large and increasing French minority); biculturalism tends to gain most support from French minorities outside Quebec or British within Quebec; "francisation" has increasingly become the policy of Quebec, supported by a substantial French majority; leaving multiculturalism largely restricted to the ethnically diverse western provinces and larger cities.

TABLE ONE

APPROXIMATE ETHNIC PROPORTIONS IN CANADIAN PROVINCES AND TERRITORIES

	% Native Origin	% British Origin	% French Origin	% Other Origins
West Coast				
British Columbia	2	59	4	35
Prairies				
Alberta	2	45	6	47
Saskatchewan	3	40	6	51
Manitoba	3	43	9	45
Central Canada				
Ontario	1	60	10	29
French Canada				
Quebec	1	11	81	7
Maritimes				
New Brunswick	less than 1%	55	39	6
Prince Edward Island	"	80	17	3
Nova Scotia	"	72	12	16
Newfoundland	"	93	4	3
North				
Yukon	15	47	7	31
Northwest Territories	58	21	6	15

B. The Argument for Persistence

Isajiw (1975: 9-11) has developed a carefully qualified theory of ethnic persistence: "The phenomenon of what has been called 'new ethnicity' is widespread enough both in Canada and in the United States to warrant the conclusion that there must be some factors within the present state of the structure of our society as a whole which contribute to the retention or 'rediscovery' of ethnic identity among the established ethnic groups." Isajiw has suggested that "the dynamics of ethnic pluralism as a current social phenomenon involving the established ethnic groups, regardless of ethnic economic differentiation, have to be sought in the structure and processes in our society as a whole, rather than simply in the structures of the ethnic enclaves themselves .... To understand the process of ethnic persistence from one generation to another, one should focus on the question of retention of ethnic identity, rather than simply on retention or perpetuation of ethnic culture or ethnic institutions." Isajiw assumes that intellectually the most fruitful way — if not the only way — to assess continuity between ethnic generations is in terms of the social psychological concept of ethnic identity; purely sociological concepts are not enough. But "this is not to say that cultural patterns are not involved in the persistence of ethnicity across generations. Retention of any identity always requires some symbolic expression." Yet, "it would be unrealistic and contrary to the available data to assume that what ethnically conscious members of the third generation are trying to do is to simply contain and retain all ossified traditions of their ancestors. The contrary appears to be true, if they want to retain any traditions, they are those which are most meaningful to their own life in society as a whole. The consecutive generations are to a high degree culturally assimilated into the total society.

They, nevertheless, have the ability to turn to their ancestral past and pick from it those cultural patterns in which they may find meaning. But the meaning which they do find in them is different from that which these patterns had had for their ancestors. Hence the continuity between generations is provided not by the patterns themselves, but by the feeling of identity with the people who have also attached meanings to the patterns, even if the meanings themselves are different or contradictory." Thus, Isajiw has pointed out that ethnic identity of the third generation should not be assumed to be the same phenomenon as that of the first generation. Some forms of ethnic identity may disappear with one generation, while others may emerge and be perpetuated with consecutive generations.

In a later paper with an imaginative title, "Olga in Wonderland: Ethnicity in a Technological Society", Isajiw (1978: 29-30) further explains that his basic concern is "not the introduction of technology into traditional ethnic societies, but the reverse, that is, the process by which ethnic groups are introduced into, and remain part of, technological societies." He contends "that on the one hand technology and the technological culture bring ethnic groups together, yet on the other hand, and in an indirect way, they contribute to the persistence and perpetuation of ethnicity in North American societies."

The first point that Isajiw makes is a good one. Namely, that the persistence of ethnicity should be sought in the larger structures and processes of the society as a whole. However, his extrapolation from this premise is not a necessary nor, we feel, a fruitful one in understanding the persistence of ethnicity (ie., his view that one should focus on the question of retention

of ethnic identity). The more logical extension of his argument would be that one should focus on the objective structural factors which bring into being ethnic-based phenomena such as ethnic institutions and then trace the process whereby these structural factors make salient ethnic identity and the impetus to organize along ethnic lines, etc. Focussing on the study of ethnic identity per se could limit one's understanding to the manifestations of certain subjective states among ethnic members. What one would like to understand are the reasons for — and the nature of — the process of generation of these subjective states.

At least five basic considerations may be related to the argument for the persistence of ethnic heterogeneity in Canadian society and for the longevity of multiculturalism. First, some ethnic minorities in Canada are "visible", that is to say, racially distinct from the bulk of the population. As the vast majority of Canadians are white, in the Canadian case the "visible" ethnic minorities are non-white groups, such as East Indians, West Indians and Blacks, Chinese and Japanese, native peoples, etc. To a considerable extent ethnic identity has been, and may continue to be, imposed on these racial minorities (directly or indirectly) because they are easily identifiable through visibility; or ethnic consciousness is perhaps more likely to arise as visible minority members group together in defensive solidarity, in defensive reaction to perceived/actual discrimination/exploitation. Moreover, racial amalgamation tends to proceed more slowly than cultural exchange or assimilation, at least in North America. Non-white Canadians have been subjected to deportation, segregation, economic exclusion, harassment and discriminatory immigration practices, although a larger proportion of recent immigrants into Canada have been non-white. Therefore, it seems that generalizations about assimilation, integration and the like which may be applied to Canadian ethnic groups distinguished by their different cultures more than by

physical appearance do not necessarily hold for "visible" minorities.

Second, the ability of an ethnic group in North America to maintain its separate identity may be highly dependent upon replenishment through continued immigration. As Richmond has commented (Toronto Star, January 19, 1974), "the reason we have such ethnic awareness today is because we still have a stream of immigration. The future situation will depend on how big the immigration flow is and how much money is allocated to multiculturalism programmes." The recency of immigration accounts for much of the multicultural character of the larger cities. Ethnic identity change is more in evidence, we would contend, outside these cities (with the obvious exception of French in Quebec, virtually a state within a state, and of conservative ethno-religious groups, such as the Hutterites, and of the native peoples segregated on reserves). The vast majority of the most recent immigrants, a large proportion of them non-white, have concentrated in the larger cities, particularly Toronto, although the federal government's latest immigration policy may induce prospective immigrants to disperse (Anderson, 1977b).

A distinction should be drawn, then, between ethnic groups consisting primarily of relatively recent (first-generation) immigrants (e.g. Greeks, Portuguese, Chileans and other Spanish-speakers, Vietnamese, West Indians, East Indians, etc.), on the one hand, and ethnic groups longer settled in Canada (eg. including not only the so-called "charter" groups — British and French — who may be conceived as less concerned with the persistence of their ethnicity than with the aggrandizement of their collective economic and political power, but also including such Euro-Canadian groups as Ukrainians, Germans, Scandinavians, etc.). These two basic types, immigrant/concentrated and established/dispersed, are of course interrelated, but the primarily

immigrant groups are more concerned with problems of adjustment whereas the primarily established groups tend to be concerned with persistence (Isajiw 1975: 2), implying, in turn, two basic types of multicultural policies aimed at these differing concerns.

Third, the degree of institutional completeness and enclosure of ethnic minorities may bear on ethnic persistence. According to the concept of insitutional completeness, first applied by Breton (1964) to immigrant communities in Montreal, "some of the most crucial factors bearing on the absorption of immigrants would be found in the social organization of the communities which the immigrant contacts in the receiving country .... the community of his ethnicity, the native (receiving) community, and the other ethnic communities." Breton felt that "the integration of the immigrant should not be seen from a purely assimilationist point of view in which integration is said to have taken place when the immigrant is absorbed in the receiving society. Integration was rather conceived of as taking place in any one of the communities mentioned above or in two or three directions at the same time. That is, an immigrant can establish a network of social affiliations extending beyond the boundaries of any one community. Finally, it is also possible for the immigrant to be unintegrated." Breton argued that "the direction of the immigrant's integration will to a large extent result from the forces of attraction (positive or negative) stemming from the various communities." He examined "the extent to which institutional completeness of the ethnic community is related to its capacity to attract the immigrant within its social boundaries." Breton pointed out that "ethnic communities can vary enormously in their social organization .... Institutional completeness would be at its extreme whenever the ethnic community could perform all the services required by its members." But Breton has admitted that "of course, in contemporary North American cities very few, if any, ethnic communities showing full institutional completeness can be found."

This model provided by Breton has generated much discussion in Canadian ethnic studies. For example, Vallee (1969: 23-24) essentially supported Breton in reiterating the need for the organization of ethnic group structures and institutions which influence socialization and ethnic community decision-making. Institutional completeness has been stressed -- among other factors -- within a paradigm on "criteria for the examination of ethnic survival" formulated for a workshop on ethnicity in Canada (Anderson 1975a). The concepts of institutional completeness and residential segregation have been combined by Driedger and Church (1974) in their research on Winnipeg. Similarly, institutional completeness was taken into consideration in a study of ethnic enclosure among West Indian immigrants in a Toronto neighbourhood (Anderson 1975b). Following van den Berghe (1965: 78-9), Schermerhorn (1970: 127) had explained: "social or structural pluralism varies from maximal to minimal forms which can be conceptualized as degrees of enclosure with indicators like endogamy, ecological concentration, institutional duplication, associational clustering, rigidity and clarity of group definition, segmentary relations of members with outsiders, etc."

Interesting as these various Canadian studies may be, in focussing primarily or exclusively on endogenous factors, they are restricted, by and large, to a level of analysis which is empirical "rapportage". They describe situations of ethnic community organization, but do not go very far in taking into consideration the exogenous structural context, therefore contribute relatively little to a comprehensive theory of ethnic persistence of change. Breton has at least moved away from emphasizing institutional completeness per se toward emphasizing ethnic collectivies' organizational capacity for collective action (Breton 1974a). Thus, an ethnic community, conceptualized in terms of the organizational aspect of ethnic group behaviour rather than in

terms of such elements as culture or ethnic identity, may be said to consist of congeries of organizations and associations holding different types and degrees of relations to each other. Empirically, an ethnic community can range from a multidimensional matrix of institutions that interact with each other, covering a wide range of communal concerns to a large number of autonomous organizations with little interaction among them, serving often duplicative functions. Most recently Breton (1978: 55) has argued that, while there has been ample research on the degree of inequality and the occurrence of conflict among Canadian ethnic collectivities, relatively little has been done toward developing conceptual frameworks for analyzing the various types of ethnic collectivities found in Canadian society, or how such variations affect the ways these collectivities relate to each other. Breton has suggested that we know little about the conditions under which people establish relationships and form groups on an ethnic basis, or about variations in institutional arrangements which may/may not emerge to accommodate existing cultural diversity, or about particular forms of institutional accommodations.

Fourth, structural constraints may serve to prolong ethnic diversity. Where do ethnic groups, particularly recent immigrants and non-whites (increasingly one and the same) fit into the capitalist socio-economic structure? We have already noted above Isajiw's (1975: 9) position that the dynamics of ethnic pluralism have to be sought in the structure and processes of society as a whole, rather than simply the structures of the ethnic enclaves themselves. In other words previous research accounting for variations in the extent and type of organizational activity across communities, ethnic or otherwise, has focussed on factors endogenous to the organizations or interorganizational field (e.g. leadership structure, mass-elite relationships, organizational resources, etc.) or to the ethnic community as a

whole (e.g. cultural heritage); while exogenous variables (such as the political and economic context in which organizations are located) have heretofore played a peripheral role in most analyses of community activity (Stasiulis 1979: 1). Yet it is precisely these exogenous factors which account for selectivity in immigration policy (Li and Bolaria, 1979), entry into the labour force, distribution of immigrants, etc. Structural analysis is vital to an in-depth understanding not only of ethnic persistence versus change but also multicultural policies.

Fifth, numerous historians, sociologists and other commentators writing about the Canadian ethnic mosaic have suggested that the durability of ethnic diversity in this country owes much to the Anglo-French bilingual-bicultural framework. After all, so this argument goes, bilingualism and biculturalism have served as an important bulwark against Americanization, and have contributed to an emphasis on ethnicity within Canadian society, contrasting to an American emphasis on the "melting-pot". However, this line of thinking is rather simplistic. The United States is in point of fact not a melting pot; not only does that country include large concentrations of Blacks and Spanish-speaking population (in some respects comparable to the concentration of French population within Canada), but also innumerable examples of urban ethnic neighbourhoods and rural ethnic settlements (comparable to the Canadian ethnic mosaic). Moreover, Canadian society is not as much uniformly multicultural, nor bicultural; as we have noted above, multiculturalism, biculturalism, or uniculturalism (represented in anglo-conformity or "francophonism") may prevail in one province, region or area.

In many respects Canadian bilingualism and biculturalism is a myth. On the one hand, Canada has long been officially bilingual at the national level. On the other hand, in fact only 13.4% of Canadians (not quite one

out of every eight Canadians) were bilingual in English and French in 1971, and most of these bilingual Canadians were French; very few Anglo-Canadians were at all conversant in French. Of at least a million and a half "French" Canadians outside Quebec, about a third no longer recognize French as their mother-tongue and more than half of them did not speak French as their primary language at home. In fact, in every province outside Quebec except New Brunswick, the majority of French-origin population were not using French primarily at home:

TABLE TWO

USE OF FRENCH LANGUAGE BY FRENCH POPULATION AT HOME,

IN PROVINCES OUTSIDE QUEBEC, 1971

Province	Canadian-born French-origin Population	Number Speaking French as Primary Language at Home	Proportion not Speaking French as Primary Language at Home
Newfoundland	15,140	1,930	87.3%
Prince Edward Island	15,140	4,185	72.4%
Nova Scotia	78,555	25,355	67.7%
New Brunswick	232,370	189,930	18.3%
Ontario	719,190	324,045	54.9%
Manitoba	83,680	35,415	57.7%
Saskatchewan	53,690	13,750	74.4%
Alberta	89,860	19,525	78.3%
British Columbia	89,985	8,270	90.8%

One might also note, in passing, that within Quebec there were over 23 thousand Canadian-born French-origin people who could not speak French. In Canada as a whole, 275,795 Canadians not claiming French origin nonetheless considered French to be their mother-tongue, 204,265 of them residents of Quebec. Within Quebec a unilingual "francisation" policy is likely to increase this number of non-French-origin francophones, of course.

C. The Argument for Change

During the past decade a number of Canadian sociologists (Anderson 1972, 1977a, Driedger 1975, Isajiw 1975, 1978) have pointed-out that the measure of ethnic identification may vary according to the criteria used to measure it. If considerable attention has been devoted by sociologists to the persistence of ethnicity in Canadian society, perhaps they have devoted even more attention to ethnic identity change. A myriad of recent studies has indicated clearly that ethnic identity - whether revealed in, for example, retention of traditional language, religious affiliation, certain customs or an institutional infrastructure -- is steadily changing from generation to generation, particularly among the established, longer-settled Euro-Canadian minorities (this generalization becomes less true, however, for recent immigrants, particularly non-whites, as noted above). For example, extensive research has been conducted on the rates, causes, and consequences of ethnic identity change by Driedger in Manitoba and Anderson in Saskatchewan. These authors have focussed on cross-ethnic research on specific topics, such as institutional completeness (Driedger 1973, 1974), cultural identity factors (Driedger 1975, Anderson 1972, 1977a), language trends (Anderson 1978a, 1978c), and intermarriage attitudes and trends (Anderson 1974b); or they have focussed on various aspects of identity change in specific ethnic groups such as Mennonites (eg. numerous publications by Driedger and a joint chapter by both authors, Anderson and Driedger 1979), French (Driedger 1976, Anderson 1974a, 1978c, 1979a: Appendix), and Ukrainians (Driedger 1978, 1979, Anderson 1976, 1978b, 1979a). An earlier, more general theoretical statement on intergenerational changes in ethnic identification was made by Nahirny and Fishman (1965).

To briefly illustrate the probable erosion of ethnicity across Canada, at least among the established Euro-Canadian groups, let us examine census

data on two principal cultural criteria in the objective definition of ethnicity: language and religion, excluding subjective considerations for now as well as bio-physical criteria, while bearing in mind that census data are neither as accurate nor as informative as more detailed survey data.

According to 1971 census data, most Canadians of German, Jewish, Dutch, Polish, Ukrainian, Russian, Czechoslovakian, Scandinavian, or Japanese origin no longer recognized their group's traditional language as their mother-tongue. The majority of people in these groups, as well as those of Finnish, Hungarian, or native origin, did not speak primarily the traditional ethnic language at home:

TABLE THREE

PROPORTION OF PEOPLE OF SELECTED ETHNIC ORIGINS RECOGNIZING ETHNIC MOTHER TONGUE AND USING IT AS A PRIMARY LANGUAGE AT HOME, 1971

Ethnic Group:	Proportion Recognizing Traditional Mother Tongue:	Proportion Using It as Primary Language at Home:
Jewish	16.6	8.5
Scandinavian	20.0	2.1
Dutch	32.4	7.7
German	35.9	13.9
Russian	37.0	16.0
Polish	38.4	19.9
Japanese	42.3	24.5
Czechoslovakian	48.4	26.0
Ukrainian	48.9	22.8
Hungarian	53.7	30.2
Native Groups	53.9	42.0
Finnish	56.0	28.0
Italian	70.4	57.2
Chinese	76.5	62.4
Greek	78.3	65.6
Portuguese	82.8	72.3

It can be noted that language change has proceeded farther among the established Euro-Canadian groups than among recent and non-white immigrant groups.

Religion, like language, has often been stressed by sociologists as bolstering ethnic identity. Yet in Canada census data inform us that in fact more and more ethnic groups have been moving away from their traditional religious affiliation through the processes of conversion, secularization, and particularly intermarriage. To cite some examples, by 1971 only a third (33.4%) of Canadians of Scandinavian origin were still Lutherans (although among those of Finnish descent almost double that proportion - 60.3% - were Lutherans). Half (52.2%) of Ukrainian-Canadians were neither Ukrainian Orthodox or Catholic. Almost a third (29.1%) of Polish-Canadians (excluding Jews) were no longer Roman Catholics. Little more than half

(about 55%, if that) of the Canadians claiming Dutch descent were Catholics, Reformed, or Mennonites. A third (33.1%) of Czechoslovakian-Canadians were neither Catholic nor Lutheran. Over a third of a million (368,660) French Canadians and over 50,000 (50,910) Italian Canadians were not Catholics. And thousands of Greeks in Canada are no longer Greek Orthodox, Hungarians are neither Catholic nor Lutheran, Portuguese not Catholic, Russians neither Doukhobors nor Russian Orthodox, etc. etc.

Intermarriage between Canadians of different ethnic origins has doubtless served to weaken the solidarity of many ethnic groups and has probably brought - about a general de-emphasis of ethnicity (Anderson 1974b). By 1971 the majority of Canadian-born family heads in several large ethnic groups were intermarried: Scandinavian 80.9%, Polish 75.9, Hungarian 74.2, Dutch 73.1, Italian 69.9, German 61.7, Russian 59.0, Ukrainian 55.0. Yet the majority of Canadian-born family heads in the British, French, Jewish, and Asian ethnic groups were still endogamous.

Census and survey data have provided ample evidence of a declining interest in ethnicity if one measures the strength of ethnicity in terms of such criteria as language, religion, and endogamy. But some ethnic groups have not emphasized maintenance of a unique mother tongue; (Scots, Irish, Jews, etc.) while other ethnic groups were already anglophone (West Indians, East Indians, etc.) or francophone (Haitians, and perhaps Lebanese, Sephardic and Moroccan Jews, Vietnamese) before immigrating. At any rate, loss of ability to converse in an ethnic mother tongue does not necessarily imply complete loss of ethnic identity, i.e. assimilation; it may indicate a reinterpretation of the criteria considered vital to that identity (Anderson 1978a). Moreover, religious affiliation can be changed quite arbitrarily. And as for intermarriage as an indicator of ethnic identity change, we would do well to heed Isajiw's (1975:11) caution that "partners of

ethnically mixed marriages often retain their respective identities". Nonetheless, our point is that when an ethnic group has unsuccessfully attempted to maintain its identity through preservation of these criteria, then ethnicity must be redefined and ethnic diversity or multiculturalism may come into question. A case in point might be Ukrainian Canadians, some of whom are ardent advocates and supporters of multiculturalism; in point of fact, we have noted that a majority can no longer speak Ukrainian, nor are they members of principal Ukrainian churches, nor are their spouses and families homogeneous Ukrainian (see Jaworsky 1977 for a summary of the Ukrainians' own views toward multiculturalism). So at least to an appreciable extent, as Smith (1970: 250) has appropriately commented:

> The mosaic concept is also an idealization of reality. A greater degree of behavioural assimilation has taken place in Canada than that concept would appear to allow for. The majority of second generation German-Canadians, Icelandic-Canadians, and even Ukrainian-Canadians speak English and not their parents' native tongue. Their Old World culture, when it is retained, is regarded as something to be brought out and dusted off, rather self-consciously, on special occasions. It does not form a central part of Canada's cultural life, and when it is brought to the attention of Canadians at large, the tendency is to regard it as an imported exotic.

Despite a plethora of studies of "assimilation", "adaptation", and "integration" of Canadian ethnic minorities, few authors have clearly distinguished between assimilation or loss of ethnic culture and reinterpretation of ethnicity; as Isajiw (1975, 1978) has clearly argued, one can discern ethnic identity change without assimilation in the sense of a complete or gradual loss of aspects of ethnic culture. Moreover, there have been relatively few attempts to go beyond mere empirical reporting and to abstract theoretical paradigms for ethnic identity change or persistence (eg. Anderson 1975a, 1978d). The authors taking into consideration exogeneous controls or influences on ethnic infrastructure have been fewer still.

Among others, Li and Bolaria (1979) have argued strongly for an abandonment of simplistic assimilation studies in favour of a more far-reaching causal analysis of structural conditions, particularly as these conditions affect non-white immigrant groups:

> The image of nonwhites in Canada has been frequently distorted by both academics and policy makers. These distortions are based, in part, on assumptions of ethnic lives and cultures that are neither supported by empirical evidence nor theoretical arguments. Until the recent past, however, these assumptions have been unquestionably accepted by sociologists in their construction of assimilation models as basic tools to interpret the meanings of ethnicity.....
>
> From a broader theoretical perspective, it can be seen that such racial biases, in academic theory and social practice, tend to facilitate exploitations of nonwhite labour in the capitalist market....
>
> The first camp within the assimilation school includes those who argue the gradual dilution of cultural traits among ethnic immigrants. Anglo-conformists and melting-pot proponents, although differing on their emphasis on Anglo-Saxon culture versus an amalgamated product as the destination, have much in common in this respect--they both argue that immigrant groups are giving up the traits in their assimilation into the new world. Among the second camp are pluralists who stress the persistence of ethnic culture despite assimilation. Examples include, for instance, models of pluralism and triple melting pot.....
>
> Despite the theoretical differences, these divergent views share one important aspect, that it is the distinctiveness of cultural origin which is being emphasized, and that such distinctiveness, whether cultural or institutional, is an important determinant in explaining ethnic differences. In stressing the persistence or disappearance of cultural traits and institutions, proponents from both camps in fact recognize the importance of cultural origins in explaining subsequent behaviours of ethnic groups.....
>
> The primary objection to the assimilation perspective is not so much whether assimilation as a process, however it is defined, takes place, or whether cultural origin as an attribute, exists or not. Rather, the challenge is based on the frequent allusion that the uniqueness in cultural origin is necessarily the cause of ethnic differences. There are mounting evidence and theoretical dispositions to suggest that the basic assimilationist position is false. For example, (some sociologists) show that among many groups the maintenance of ethnicity in America is attributed to the structural conditions of that society rather than to some transplanted cultural heritage from the Old World....

> The assimilationist position also suffers from a basic lack of clarity in the way the model is applied. The confusion arises from the causal application of the model as a description and explanation of the same ethnic phenomena....
>
> Ironically, assimilation theories frequently represent more idealistic projections of the future than objective realism of the present, or the past. To the extent that they are ethnocentric ideologies centred around the WASP culture, they are, as Lyman (1974) put it, mere projections of the dominant ethos of the larger society, an ethos which has too often been taken over uncritically by the sociologist.

Undoubtedly some Canadian sociologists would with reason take strong exception to these final suggestions that assimilation theories tend to represent idealistic projections more than objective realism, moreover that they are ethnocentric WASP ideologies. After all, the sociologist studying aspects of the process of ethnic identity change is not necessarily exclusively interpreting his findings as unidirectional assimilation, nor agreeing with anglo-conformity or some such assimilatory goal set by the so-called "dominant" society (however that is defined), nor more inclined toward "idealistic projections" than "objective realism". Yet the authors' criticism of ambiguous and tautological assimilation theories, and advocacy of a structural approach, are well taken.

2. MULTICULTURALISM AS FANCY/IDEOLOGY

A. The Variability of Subjective Interest in Ethnicity

Having appraised the factual extent of Canadian multiculturalism in terms of ethnic persistence or change, let us now turn to a discussion of multiculturalism as fancy or ideology, focussing first on the variability of subjective interest in ethnicity. We have asked, in the introduction to this paper, whether multiculturalism should be viewed as a fanciful retreat or preoccupation of selected ethnic group members, also how ethnicity is perceived by ethnic group members, and who exactly is a member in the first place. In a recent paper, Breton (1978: 55) commented: "In a way, our

ethnic origin is always with us, but it is not always operative in determining social behaviour and in shaping social organization."

Ethnic identity may be objectively defined in terms of certain criteria (language, religion, customs, etc.). However, as we have noted in the preceding section of this paper, the identifying criteria may vary from group to group and may change from generation to generation. Moreover, subjective awareness of ethnicity is highly variable; not every ethnic group "member" chooses to emphasize (in some manner or another) his/her ethnicity. Of course, it may be emphasized for the number (as in visible racial minorities). But, with reference to the principal objective cultural criteria of ethnicity, a given ethnic group member may choose not speak or use a traditional mother tongue, not to be a member of a traditional religious affiliation, nor to follow certain customs. Moreover, in terms of ethnic group behaviour, the individual member may choose not to participate in certain associations or institutions of the ethnic group. Indeed, we have seen that within several of the larger, established Canadian ethnic minorities a majority of members have already lost contact with these ethnic criteria. It would hardly come as a surprise, then, to find that many, probably an increasing number, of ethnic group members do not really feel very "ethnic". Yet one must be wary of jumping to that conclusion because — as we have already cautioned, following Isajiw — a "new ethnicity" among the third generation may assume the form of a keen interest in one's genealogical and ethnic history, regardless of one's ability to speak the mother tongue or one's religious inclinations.

B. Overemphasis of Ethnicity

Ethnicity has been carelessly overemphasized in the literature of sociology and other social sciences, as exemplified in frequent mention of the term "ethnic groups", and in frequent citing of census data referring

to ethnic, linguistic, and religious populations.

First, can we legitimately talk about the "ethnic group"? Or are we actually referring to collectivities (the term preferred by Breton) of ethnic-minded individuals? But do "ethnic-minded" individuals necessarily represent group interests? What proportion of the claimed members of a given ethnic group are actually aware of, interested in, or readily identifiable by their ethnic identity?

Burnet (1975:7) has pointed-out that "only a portion, and probably a small portion, of Canadians have participated in a complete, living folk culture; only a portion have learned folk customs and folk arts in their homeland; (and) those who have learned parts of their ancestral folk culture in Canada have sometimes been informed by guardians of its purity that what their grandparents taught them was debased or distorted."

Elaborating on Breton's point that the ethnic community in its organizational aspect is not likely to represent all segments of a collectivity of a certain ethnic origin, Stasiulis (1979) has continued to explain that "in fact, it may systematically exclude certain sections of the ethnic population and articulate the interests of only a limited number of elements within the total ethnic population, as defined by social class, ideology, region, religion, or other diacritica."

Second, to return to our argument that ethnicity has been overemphasized, it has often been reiterated - but apparently not often enough - that census definitions of ethnic origin are highly unreliable. The census counts in its "ethnic origin" category only those who claim the ethnic origin of the original male immigrant or predecessor to Canada. Thus, on the one hand, census data for some ethnic groups are underestimated; if we were to also count female predecessors or immigrants, and consider a person to be in an ethnic category

by virtue of either male or female predecessors, some ethnic collectivities would be considerably larger. On the other hand, census data exaggerate the size of ethnic groups, or at least give us a very misleading impression, because of high proportions of intermarriage. In other words, census data on ethnic origins do not refer as much to homogeneous ethnic groups as to mixed populations. As we have already noted in discussing intermarriage vis-a-vis ethnic identity change, only a relatively small proportion, a minority, of several significant Canadian ethnic groups are in any sense homogeneous. Most Canadians, as counted in the census, of German, Dutch, Scandinavian, Italian, Ukrainian, Russian, Polish, Hungarian, or etc. ethnic origin are in fact only partially members of each relevant ethnic "group". This crucial fact is more often than not glossed-over in Canadian social science literature.

C. The Romanticization of Ethnic Identity and Ethnic History

We have already suggested that multiculturalism may be more of a new concept than a time-honoured institution. Nonetheless, Canadian writers and speechmakers have been fond of telling us that immigrants have brought with them to Canada a rich variety of old world cultures. Indeed they have. But there can be little doubt that ethnicity - and for that matter, multiculturalism - is often romanticized. Pertinent questions might be: Which aspects and how much of ethnic cultures were actually "invented" in the new world rather than the old world? (see, for example, Anderson 1976 on Ukrainian-Canadian culture). Do immigrants necessarily see themselves as contributors to a Canadian cultural mosaic, or do some - perhaps political refugees or potential return migrants - view their stay in Canada as only temporary? (see for example, Anderson 1975b on return migration among West Indian immigrants). Have historians tended to romanticize or distort the old world background of ethnic groups?

(see, for example, Anderson 1973 on the romantic tradition among Scottish-Canadians). Have they stereotyped ethnic groups in Canada from an ethnocentric standpoint? (see, eg. Palmer 1975 and 1976 on Anglo-Canadian views of multiculturalism).

In recent years a number of sociologists (eg. Anderson 1975c, 1977a, Clark 1976, Burnet 1979, Herman 1979) have commented on some of the myths of multiculturalism. We have already dismissed the myth that Canadian society is a cultural mosaic while American society is a melting-pot. We are tempted to note in passing that anglo-conformity is not restricted to the Canadian "dominant society"; it has been mentioned by many American sociologists as well; and at any rate it may well be outdated, historically anachronistic and sociologically insignificant today in either country. We have also stressed that to call Canada bilingual and bicultural can be rather misleading. But to mention a few more myths:

— North America was not "discovered" by the English, nor Spanish, French, Vikings, Basques or any other Europeans (as some historians would still have us believe). It was first settled, and therefore presumably 'discovered', by native people (this should hardly come as a great revelation).

— Several Canadian ethnic groups - not only obvious ones, like the English and French, but also Scandinavians, Portuguese, Celtic Irish, and Highland Scots - are fond of claiming a long history of settlement in Canada. These claims too often border on mythology; at best they are exaggerations.

— Some ethnic groups have also revealed a propensity to exaggerate the proportion they form out of the total Canadian population. Coupled with this tendency is the not infrequent statement that the "third force" (non-British, non-French) has grown to be about a third of the Canadian population. But if French Canadians also comprise a third, as is often claimed, then Canadians of British origin make up the remaining third. Not

so..... in point of fact "British" Canadians make up about 45% of the Canadian population and have even increased their proportion slightly between the 1961 and 1971 censuses. The "others" comprise about a quarter, the French a little more, but neither a third.

TABLE FOUR

CHANGING PROPORTION WHICH CANADIANS OF BRITISH, FRENCH, NATIVE, AND OTHER ORIGINS FORMED OUT OF TOTAL CANADIAN POPULATION 1921-1971

	1921	1931	1941	1951	1961	1971
British	55.4	51.9	49.7	47.9	43.8	44.6
French	27.9	28.2	30.3	30.8	30.4	28.7
Native*	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.4
Other	15.4	18.7	18.9	20.1	24.6	25.3

*probably excluding large numbers of Metis, especially in 1941.

— French Canadians do not "breed like rabbits"; they are not largely a priest-ridden peasantry. In fact Quebec has had, for the past decade, the lowest birth rate for any province in the country. A high proportion of Quebecois are urban residents; a low proportion attend church regularly; and the leadership of at least four major labour unions is avowedly Marxist.
— There is also what Burnet (1979: 14) has called the myth of common bonds among the members of the "other" ethnic groups, or sometimes common bonds among all the minorities. She has lucidly questioned:

> .....whether common bonds exist. The other ethnic groups vary in many respects, among them numbers; region of concentration; time of arrival; occupational, income and educational distribution; physical characteristics; relations with their homeland; degree of ethnic awareness, and capacity for collective action. Moreover, there are among them memories of old wars and antagonisms. Indeed, even the members of a single ethnic group are usually highly differentiated, especially if some of them have lived in Canada for a long time. As for the French Canadians, they seem unaware of many of the ethnic distinctions that exist among those that they lump together as English Canadians, and of any comparison

> between their claims and those of other ethnic groups. Likewise, the native peoples are convinced of the uniqueness of their situation and their rights. Hence, while temporary coalitions of ethnic groups concerning specific issues, such as immigration policy, may occur, no Third Force is likely to emerge.

-- Burnet (1979: 15-22) has also pointed out that a current vogue is the replacement of the myth of British benevolence with yet another myth, that of British villainy, the unremitting oppression of other ethnic groups by those of British origin; this latter myth holds that racial and ethnic prejudice and discrimination are peculiarly Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Celtic, in short, WASP-ish (never mind the formality that approximately half of the British-origin population of Canada are of Scottish, Irish, and Welsh origin, hence hardly "Anglo-Saxon", or that a significant proportion of these British-origin Canadians are Catholics rather than Protestants). Burnet has argued that "it is important to question the myth of oppression by those of British origin because denigration of Canadians of British origin is no firmer basis for multiculturalism than denigration of other Canadians. If we are to understand one another, we must forego the pleasure of regarding some ethnic groups as more virtuous than others....." However, the present authors would not agree that Anglo-Canadian oppression of ethnic minorities has been entirely mythical; unfortunately there has been far too much evidence to the contrary.

3. MULTICULTURALISM AS POLICY

A. The Emergence of a New Multicultural Policy

In the introduction to this paper we have suggested that Canadian government policies toward ethnic minorities have been continuously in flux between anglo-conformity, racism, biculturalism, token multiculturalism, pan-Canadian nationalism, separatism, Americanization, etc. As Burnet (1979: 1-3) has pointed-out, "official recognition of the ethnic diversity

of the population as continuing and desirable has been relatively recent. Until the 1960s government policy concerning immigration was based on the principle that those who were admitted into Canadian society should be assimilable into the dominant British and French ethnic groups. Even policy regarding native peoples was dominated by that principle: it was aimed at isolation and gradual assimilation. The immigration policy bore hardest upon those peoples who were considered unassimilable. .... But beyond rhetoric singularly little support was given by either federal or provincial governments to groups that wanted to maintain their old world heritages. Cultural agencies, with niggardly funding, could afford little attention to any groups other than the British, French and natives. Private broadcasting in languages other than English and French was strictly regulated, and permitted only when it could be justified in terms of 'integration'; the public corporation, the CBC, recognized only English and French; the teaching of other languages including Indian and Inuit languages, was proscribed, and even the teaching of modern languages was not greatly encouraged.

In the post-war period and especially since the beginning of this decade, the number of state policies and programmes in Canada directed explicitly to the incorporation of non-British and non-French groups has grown considerably. The particular "ideology" of the state, in the sense defined by Poulantzas (1975: 17) as an "ensemble of material practices" with regard to the "other" groups did not emerge as a holistic and fully coherent one, but rather incrementally as a response to a number of economic and political developments.

The state's increased involvement in the field of ethnic relations can be attributed to a process involving three major factors: 1) the growth in federal revenue, 2) the threats to societal integration presented by political developments in Quebec, and 3) the growing assertiveness of the

more affluent and powerful of the "other" ethnic groups (Palmer, 1976; Loney, 1977).

The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, set up in response to the growing assertiveness of French Canadian political nationalism, provided impetus for organized segments of the "other" ethnic groups to articulate the sentiment that the bicultural framework was offensive to non-charter ethnic groups, relegating them to the status of second-class citizens. The ad hoc response of the Commission was to write a fourth book on the "other ethnic groups", leading subsequently in the early 1970s to the adoption by the federal and several provincial governments (Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta) of a formal policy of multiculturalism (Palmer, 1976: 101-2).

Writing on the French reaction to multiculturalism, Isajiw (1975: 19-20) has commented:

> The other camp is the French, who insist that if there is official recognition of the French language, there should also be official recognition of the French culture. Hence they object to the linking of bilingualism with multiculturalism. Rather, they would prefer linking it with biculturalism. It is not clear how many French Canadians favour this position, but it appears that by and large in Quebec the ideology of multiculturalism is not popular. On the contrary, it is seen as a policy detracting from the long struggle of French Canadians to achieve equal partnership with the British Canadians. Further, as current governmental policy, multiculturalism has been officially linked to the policy of bilingualism. It can be argued that the policy of bilingualism has already given the French some political leverage, and has provided some institutionalized symbolic recognition of equality.

On October 8, 1971, the Prime Minister announced the federal government's acceptance of recommendations from the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism directed to federal departments and agencies; and proclaimed a policy of "multiculturalism within a bilingual framework". The government pledged to provide support for such a policy in four ways:

> First, resources permitting, the government will seek to assist all Canadian cultural groups that have demonstrated a desire and effort to continue to develop a capacity to grow and contribute to Canada, and a clear need for assistance, the small and weak groups no less than the strong and highly organized.
>
> Second, the government will assist members of all cultural groups to overcome cultural barriers to full participation in Canadian society.
>
> Third, the government will promote creative encounters and interchange among all Canadian cultural groups in the interests of national unity.
>
> Fourth, the government will continue to assist immigrants to acquire at least one of Canada's official languages in order to become full participants in Canadian society (House of Commons Debates 1971).

In 1972 Stanley Haidasz became the first "minister of state responsible for multiculturalism", within the Department of the Secretary of State; however, a completely separate ministry was soon dissolved again only a couple of years later. By 1976 a dramatic overhaul of the federal multicultural office was proposed, which was to allow more concentration on the emerging problem of racial discrimination; yet this move, or at least a move exclusively in this direction, was blocked by the established minorities more interested in preserving their languages and cultures.

A more lasting creation of the federal government has been the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism, created in 1973.

This is a rather complex federal structure with a national executive and five regional branches, and is composed of more than 100 representatives of various ethnic groups, to advise the minister. It has held three national biennial conferences, as well as a number of regional meetings out of which have come many recommendations to government (for a summary and critique of the second conference, see Montero 1975 or Dahlie 1976).

B. The Financial Problem: Funding Multiculturalism:

The scope of state funding has in recent years expanded greatly in the domains of ethnic communities as in the "voluntary sector" in general (National Advisory Council on Voluntary Action, 1978:42; Loney, 1977:456-7). With the inception of the new multicultural policy during the early seventies, the federal government contributed $4,154,000 to its multicultural ministry in 1972-3, and $10,132,000 in 1973-4 (Canadian Press, May 18, 1973). While the federal multicultural apparatus has been accused of meaningless squandering of some of its funds (with $3,000 having been granted to a "Cape Breton Irish Benevolent Society" to teach needlework and $5,000 to the Latvian National Federation to prepare a book on ornaments, etc.), the total budget accorded to multiculturalism has been relatively modest, certainly far below sums expended on various programs to aid industry. The President of the National Congress of Italian Canadians recently expressed dismay at the "miniscule" budget committed to the federal Multicultural Program for the next five years, commenting that "it must surely indicate the low priority which the government puts on the policy of multiculturalism" (Leone, 1978:66).

Despite the relatively small size of the budget allocated to multiculturalism, the programs and activities funded through multicultural grants have enjoyed high visibility through advertising in the ethnic press and widespread media coverage given to multicultural events. A "cynical" interpretation by some critics of the multicultural funding process is that the expenditures made by a particular government on multiculturalism are prompted by the purely political and partisan motive of attempting to garner votes. Although undoubtedly true for the enactment

of a large number of government policies, this interpretation of the rationale behind the creation and operation of multicultural policy is overly simplistic, a point that will later be taken up in the critique of multiculturalism from the left (Section E).

C. Provincial Multicultural Policies:

Provincial and municipal governments have also contributed to multicultural funding. For example, during the 1973-4 fiscal year alone, Ontario contributed $1.3 million expressly for its multicultural policy directed at immigrants, while that year Toronto gave $150,000 in support of ethnic festivals and other ethnic cultural activities (Toronto Star, January 19, 1974).

Burnet (1978:108) has summarized the provincial multicultural policies in four or five provinces, noting the emphasis placed on education:

> The provinces of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta have in their turn proclaimed policies of multiculturalism, and British Columbia is said to be preparing to follow suit. It is difficult to guess, of course, to what extent the adoption of the federal policy influenced the provinces: the provinces are not given to following Ottawa's lead automatically. However, since the schools are seen as having a key role to play in many of the programmes of multiculturalism and education is under provincial jurisdiction, provincial initiatives are an essential part of any picture. These have involved such measures as appointment of advisory committees or councils on multiculturalism, their members drawn from the province's ethnic groups; innumerable conferences, including conferences on curriculum; publications, including multicultural history projects, ethnocultural directories, multicultural resource lists, and periodicals having to do with heritages or multiculturalism; grants for various ethnic or multicultural projects; and in the schools expansion of the teaching of various cultures, and introduction of multiculturalism as a topic into curricula.

We would argue, however, that with the possible exceptions of Alberta and Ontario, none of these provinces have gone far enough in supporting alternative forms of education often demanded, or more politely requested,

by ethnic and ethno-religious minorities. Without realistic funding of multicultural education, as represented in second or third language instruction, ethnic-oriented histories and other textbooks, and "cultural exchange" programmes, it is not likely that decades of discrimination against these minorities, usually assuming the form of enforced anglo-conformity in the schools, will be offset. (For a bibliography on education and ethnicity, see Mallea and Phillip, 1976. Pertinent critiques of educational policies in historical and contemporary perspective are found in Appelt, 1978 and Anderson, 1978c).

Moreover, while socialization of children to a tolerant and informed view of the cultures of other ethnic and racial groups could make some inroads toward rectifying the racist attitudes of individuals, the racism inherent in the structural and institutional workings of the larger society could quite conceivably remain untouched by such an educational process.

D. Critique of Multicultural Policies:

Burnet (1978:107), an individual much involved in the formulation and assessment of Canada's recent cultural policies, has noted the achievements of federal multicultural policies. The commitment of the government in this field is demonstrated by the relative durability of multicultural structures and agents such as the Minister of State responsible for Multiculturalism (since 1972), and the Canadian Consultative Council of Multiculturalism (since 1973), and by the fact that "the budget allocated to multiculturalism has been increased in times of fiscal constraint" (1978:107). Moreover, the multicultural bodies have been actively engaged in a number of ventures:

> The Multiculturalism Directorate has carried on liaison activities with ethnic communities and with the ethnic press; initiated and developed studies and research, including a series of histories on ethnic groups; assisted the Canadian Ethnic Studies Association to develop as a full-fledged society with two regular publications; sponsored activities in the performing and visual arts; assisted in programmes aimed at retention of non-official languages and given grants for a vast array of other projects (Burnet, 1978:107).

Yet Burnet has also raised a number of pertinent criticisms of federal multicultural policies during the past seven years (1978:107-12). She notes the "uncertainty, suspicion and dissatisfaction regarding the policy" among diverse sectors of the population - including groups in Quebec, Anglocelts and many others. She points out the disjuncture between attitudes - an explicit approval of the multicultural policy, and behaviour - the rejection of the policy as indicated in the continuation of discrimination. In addition, the policy which was framed under pressures from ethnic groups of European origin and designed to meet their concerns, such as language maintenance, has not kept pace with the changing patterns of immigration and the concerns of the new "visible" minorities which "have to do with human rights, specially in the job market, rather than cultural or linguistic rights".

A more general problem with multicultural policy is the lack of consistency, clarity and continuity in both its interpretation and administration. "Since October 1971 there have been no fewer than four ministers responsible for multiculturalism". Even more problematic is the "lack of clarity and consensus concerning the aims of the policy and the means by which they are attained" among the politicians, public servants and the leaders of ethnic organizations who are all involved to greater or lesser degrees in the formulation and implementation of multicultural programmes.

Isajiw (1975:2-1) has earlier expressed the dangerous potential multicultural policies hold for becoming a strategy of "containment of the other ethnic groups, similar to that of colonial pluralism":

> ...It appears to me that the relevant leaders of the British groups still see the policy in this manner. As long as ethnic differences can still be retained in museums, exhibited as entertainment or hidden in "do-it-yourself" projects, no institutionalized recognition of equality is necessary. If however, ethnic pluralism in Canada is a phenomenon which reflects the structure and processes in society as a whole, then this old-fashioned interpretation of the policy is inadequate. In the long run it will fail to articulate the tensions which the continuing process of ethnic differentiation evokes (Isajiw, 1975:20-1).

However, Isajiw goes on to question only the "interpretation and application of the policy" rather than its basic presuppositions (1975:21).

About fifteen years ago, a prominent Canadian sociologist, John Porter (1965) argued that: "Ethnic and cultural differences are a fraud perpetrated by the British upon all other Canadians in order to keep them in their place". This view, in our opinion, is overstated and denigrating to the very real differences in values, customs and language held by diverse groups of Canadians. However, Porter's statement implies a process of manipulation of ethnic and cultural distinctions which we would agree does occur and can be observed in analyzing the exogenous structural constraints imposed on ethnic communities. A clearer understanding of multicultural policy is facilitated by relating it to the general process of state intervention in advanced capitalist societies.

E. Multiculturalism as State Control: The View From the Left

The comprehension of the rationale for-and the effects of-multicultural policy requires locating the state's practises with regard to explicitly ethnic concerns in the framework of a larger understanding of the development of the state in capitalist societies. This framework was first

suggested by O'Conner (1973) and further developed by other theorists working in the Marxist tradition (e.g.: Wolfe, 1977; Panitch, 1977; Mahon, 1977; Loney, 1977). According to O'Conner:

> the capitalistic state must try to fulfill two basic and often mutually contradictory functions - accumulation and legitimization... This means that the state must try to maintain or create the conditions in which profitable capital accumulation is possible. However, the state also must try to maintain or create the conditions for social harmony.

The process involved in multiculturalism of state agencies attempting to link themselves with ethnic organizations is related to the legitimization function of the state, i.e., to its attempt to maintain social harmony. However, the regulation of interethnic relations also implies a third state function, that of social coercion - that is, "the use by the state of its monopoly over the legitimate use of force to maintain or impose social order (Panitch, 1973:8). An active process of legitimation on the part of the state occurs when the state recognizes the demands emanating from segments of the nondominant classes which control some strategic resource - such as the ability to command votes or to cause social disruption (Wolfe, 1977:145, 150). The ability of the state to openly coerce intransigent forces is largely enhanced if the populations which are objects of state coercion are relatively powerless in economic and political terms.

Within any historical conjuncture, the state may engage in a diversity of actions and policies vis-a-vis ethnic groups which are manifestly contradictory to each other in intent - exercising its coercive function in immigration matters and widespread police harassment of certain ethnic and racial groups while at the same time providing resources for various self-help and cultural projects to ethnic organizations, thus gaining legitimacy from these ethnic populations. In general terms, it might be said with

regard to the Canadian state's stance on the social, economic and political incorporation of its nondominant ethnic groups, that prior to the Second World War, there was a tendency to enforce, through legislation, the "vertical mosaic" or to allow the dominant forces in the society at large to do so unhindered. The more usual response in the contemporary period has been 1) to alleviate, through legislation and the development of special agencies, the strains of racism and ethnic inequalities which threaten the social stability of Canadian society or the legitimacy of its government, and 2) to actively foster and control the formation of previously neglected ethnic interests and guide their incorporation into the state and civil society.

Multiculturalism, concerned as it purports to be with the achievement of equality (to the point where Burnet (1978:108) views this as the ultimate aim of the policy), has addressed itself to the problems of racism, particularly within the provincial jurisdiction of education. Powerless, however, to legislate against discrimination, multicultural bodies have confined themselves for the most part to an advisory role and to "developing understanding among peoples" (Islander, October 1, 1974: 1,3).

In terms of their output, multicultural state agencies have been much more active in representing the interests of organized ethnic bodies while concomitantly regulating their activities. Mahon (1977), examining the federal civil service, has delineated how this simultaneous process of representation and regulation of nondominant interests functions. Within the state, there exists an unequal structure of representation. Dominant interests are represented in departments with greater power and authority such as the Department of Finance, which establishes relations with all

important sectors in the Canadian political economy. Fractions of subordinate classes are represented in lower-ranking departments such as Labour, Health and Welfare, and Indian Affairs and Northern Development. The departments representing subordinate interests tend to have more delimited mandates, less relative autonomy, and fewer resources. Moreover, within them, the regulation of specific interests in reaching a compromise suited to the "national interest", which corresponds to the class interests of the hegemonic faction of the dominant class, predominates over the mere representation of "sectional", e.g.: ethnic, interests. Within the state, "all social forces achieve a form of representation. (However) the relations among the representatives express the inequalities established in civil society" (Mahon, 1977:193).

Using Mahon's suggestive framework, one can better understand the role of government agencies connected with the multicultural policy in representing the interests of non-dominant ethnic groups. A number of indices point to the relative insignificance of the state's attendance to the real and articulated interests of Canada's non-charter ethnic groups. These include the modest budget accorded to multiculturalism (especially given the size of its constituency), the lack of relative autonomy of multicultural agencies (e.g.: an absence of separate ministries at the federal or provincial levels) and its delimited, though vague mandate.

The vagueness of the mandate of multicultural bodies makes it amenable to as narrow interpretation as a particular Minister of state for Multiculturalism cares to make. For instance, the last Liberal minister, Norman Cafik's statement that "Multiculturalism was not established to create a new kind of society, but to reflect the society which we already have (Donaldson,

1979:38), implies little scope indeed for significant social change.

If one examines the four fundamental principles enumerated by the federal government concerning multiculturalism, the one referring explicitly to government intervention in alleviating socioeconomic inequities, reads:

> The Government will assist members of all cultural groups to overcome cultural barriers to full participation in Canadian society (Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism, 1975:V).

In the instance of multicultural policies, the state is claiming to meet not only the expressive, more explicitly "ethnic" needs of ethnic collectivities, but also the potentially oppositional demands for social, economic, and political equality of new immigrant or marginal groups. However, given that the claim to represent these politically volatile needs is articulated in the context of agencies and policies which emphasize cultural contributions or transformations, this strategy of state intervention can be seen as one of depoliticizing issues concerning the needs and objectives of nondominant ethnic groups.

The process of regulation of the activities of ethnic communities occurs through a multifaceted process involving state funding, but also government appointments of ethnic community leaders, consultations between community leaders and government representatives over certain issues and the formulation of legislation, attendance by government officials at important ethnic social and policy-making events (e.g.: conferences, banquets, cultural and religious celebrations) and socialization of community leaders to the ethnic policies of the state (through their attendance at state, e.g.: multicultural conferences, and through government advertisement in ethnic newspapers). It is in the relationship of dependency established when an ethnic organization accepts funds from a government agency that one can observe the most serious effects of state intervention in ethnic community affairs.

F. The Importance of State Funding of Ethnic Community Organizations:

State funding becomes an especially attractive source of financial support for ethnic associations having no independent economic base either in the form of ownership of capital or the receipt of large and regular membership dues. Funds from the government are sought, however, not only for their efficacy role, i.e., for the means which they provide for carrying out organizational activities. They are also valued for the legitimacy that is given to associations by government recognition (Loney, 1977:468). This legitimizing role of government funding may be viewed as particularly important for subordinate or marginal ethnic groups who are still suffering from lack of prestige accorded them in an earlier era of "anglo-conformity" (Palmer, 1976).

Recent studies examining the role of the government in the granting process have made the self-evident but often neglected point that government grants are given to groups whose programs meet the objectives of the grantor (Rosenblugh in Loney, 1977:463; NACVA, 1978:169). Thus, for instance, organizations truly interested in maintaining the culture of a group may be given less priority by multicultural agencies than those sponsoring multi-cultural programs of "cultural sharing".

Not only the type but also the scope of organizational activities may be severely curtailed by the nature of government funding. For instance, the trend in federal funding has recently been toward non-recurring project grants rather than sustaining grants which would sustain a voluntary association over the long run. This granting predilection works to the disadvantage of nascent and deprived groups. The groups that will likely obtain support are the larger and well-established ones which already possess organizational

continuity and cohesion and therefore are able to sustain the expenses involved in the process of applying for grants and developing project proposals. The short-term nature of these project grants permit little achievement towards any specific social goals. Often enough funds are provided only for the initial phases of a project - such as a feasibility study (Islander, January 15, 1974:4). Projects are often funded for the immediate results they yield or the high public visibility that can be given them (e.g.: conferences). The highly bureaucratized process of applying for government funds and accounting for their expenditure drains the leadership of organizations of valuable time and energy, which could otherwise be more directly utilized in the pursuit of the organization's objectives.

Not only the mere fact of state funding to associations but also where in the associational structures of ethnic communities funds are funnelled, has an impact on the community's organizational behaviour. The state, hoping to achieve the greatest impact for its dollar, will attempt to channel funds into the most "representative" organization, often the organization that is or claims to be the national umbrella organization. The government stipulates that in order for ethnic organizations to qualify for sustaining grants ("group development-operational supports") from the Minister of State for Multiculturalism, they must be national. By bestowing funds to ethnic associations which have some semblance of national organization, the intent of the federal government may be to foster structures which will further nationalist sentiments and feelings of gratification for the federal government. This propensity to fund the national umbrella organization within the community is aided by its often moderate stance on most controversial issues and its professional, "responsible" leadership. The state's choice to financially support the national organization often occurs despite

its lack of legitimacy amongst the leadership and rank and file of other community organizations, which attempt to compete for the same government funds. The recognition of this trend in funding is important in light of the criticism voiced by opponents of multiculturalism who point out the dangers of fostering "fragmentation" or "disunity" in the support of ethnic group activities by the state. The diversity of groups funded by the state does not reflect the legitimate differences in terms of culture, language, religion, social class, or political orientation existing within the organized segment, let alone the total population of an ethnic community. (This was made abundantly clear in interviews with individuals active in South Asian and Black, Toronto-based organizations.)

The fact that government agencies are becoming incorporated into the interorganizational networks of ethnic community organizations and are doing so in such a way as to be pre-eminent in their relationship with the funded oryanization, is crucial to an understanding of that organization's structure and activities. State funding can affect: i) social cohesion within the organization, ii) character of leadership, iii) "mass-elite" relationships, iv) leadership tasks, and most importantly, v) the objectives and activities of the organizations (for an elaboration of these points, see Stasiulis, 1979:16-19).

From the perspective of the ethnic collectivity as a whole, within which one can imagine a number of possible organizations, potentially linked in various ways to each other and carrying on a variety of activities, only some organizations and actions will be undertaken, largely determined by the state support given to them. Although government funding may prove attractive for certain segments of an ethnic population, the fear of losing their

autonomy may prevent other segments from approaching government agencies in the first place. The efforts of the more determinedly autonomous segments to link various organizations and associations into a unified community may be barred from doing so by the cooptation of some organizations by government agencies. Thus, the repercussions of state intervention in the funding of ethnic community associations extends well beyond the individual organizations funded to impact upon the interorganizational network(s) of the ethnic community as a whole.

Our contention that the process of social control by the state of ethnic community activities works relatively well is not meant to imply a conspiratorial or reifed view of the state or the ruling class whose interests it best represents. First of all, there are undoubtedly well-intentioned and dedicated individuals employed by state multicultural bodies who wish to promote tolerance, justice and equality within this society and are not cognizant of the extent to which their agency's activities inhibit more far-reaching efforts towards these goals. Secondly, many of the consequences of state intervention on the ethnic communities may in fact be unintended. Thirdly, the "coopted" individuals from the ethnic communities may be either naive about the consequences of state funding (rationalizing the acceptance of certain funds which meet their objectives), or ripe for cooptation. One Black organizational leader pointed out the complementarity of the generally conservative interests of black, middle class professionals in Black organizations and government bodies:

> ...Black professional leaders exploit the situation by joining community organizations to get a sense of what is happening at the grass roots level. They are able to get credibility and use it to buttress their own situation, in terms of getting more status and prestige. They've now become entrenched and become part of the institution (i.e.: the Board of Education). Most of them are very conservative because they're very unsure of their position and they

will defend the institution and call others "upstarts" and "provocateurs" (Interview with a leader of a Black organization in Toronto, July 1979).

G. Future Directions in Multicultural Policy:

During the present time, as the state responds to the deepening recession by cutting back on funds for a wide range of social programs, the purse for multiculturalism and the sponsoring of ethnic activities is likely to diminish. Interviews with leaders of South Asian and Black leaders of prominent community organizations in Toronto carried out by one of the present authors revealed that for these leaders, the dwindling government funds appeared much more salient and visible a problem than the changes incurred by the acceptance of state funds. We would hypothesize, however, that with widespread cutbacks some of the effects of state funding are not likely to change drastically, as long as some funds remain accessible to organizations, and as long as the state continues to propagate the multicultural ideology (which is the most favourable ideology towards "other" ethnic groups to date). It seems that the anticipation of some aid from the government and the formation of numerous other types of relationships with the state (some of these are listed in Section E) play an almost equal role in modifying the activities of community organizations as does the actual receiving of government funds by an organization. It is not merely the funding of ethnic organizations but the tendency to feed into the potential or actual interorganizational structures of ethnic collectivities in which one can locate the most weighty consequences of the present mode of state intervention for ethnic communities.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Alan B.

1972 Assimilation in the Bloc Settlements of North-Central Saskatchewan: A Comparative Study of Identity Change Among Seven Ethno-Religious Groups in a Canadian Prairie Region. Ph.D. thesis in sociology, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, 415 pp.

1973 "The Scottish Tradition in Canada: Its Rise and Fall", in A.H. Brodie (ed.), Scottish Colloquium Proceedings, vol. 6/7, pp. 35-47.

1974a "Ethnic Identity Retention in French Canadian Communities in Saskatchewan", paper presented at the annual meetings of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association (CSAA), University of Toronto, August 1974.

1974b "Intermarriage in Ethnic Bloc Settlements in Saskatchewan: A Cross-Cultural Survey of Trends and Attitudes", paper presented at the annual meetings of the Western Assoc. of Sociology and Anthropology, Banff, Dec. 1974.

1975a "Ethnic Groups: Implications of Criteria for the Examination of Survival", a paradigm presented in a workshop at the annual meetings of the CSAA, Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton, May 30, 1975.

1975b "Ethnic Enclosure and Discrimination in a West Indian Community in Toronto", paper presented at the Conference on Multiculturalism and Third World Immigrants in Canada, Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton, Sept. 3-6, 1975.

1975c "Myths of Multiculturalism", invited talk at the Unitarian Centre, Saskatoon, later broadcast in the Voices series, CJUS-FM, Saskatoon.

1976 "Ukrainian Identity Change in Rural Saskatchewan", in W.W. Isajiw (ed.), Ukrainians in American and Canadian Society: Contributions to the Sociology of Ethnic Groups. Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and Ukrainian Centre for Social Research, New York City. Jersey City, N.J.: M.P. Kots Publishing, pp. 93-121.

1977a "Ethnic Identity in Saskatchewan Bloc Settlements: A Sociological Appraisal", in Howard Palmer (ed.), The Settlement of the West. Calgary: Univ. of Calgary/Comprint Publishing, chap. 10, pp. 187-225.

1977b "The Changing Distribution of Immigrants in Canada: Social and Political Implications", paper presented at a Conference on Canadian Immigration Policy and the Third World Community, Univ. of Regina, Oct. 21-23, 1977.

1977c "Multiculturalism: Myth, Reality, and Policy", a talk broadcast in the Mosaic series, CJUS-FM, Saskatoon, Nov. 1.

1978a "Linguistic Trends Among Saskatchewan Ethnic Groups", in M.L. Kovacs (ed.), Ethnic Canadians: Culture and Education. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, chap. 6, pp. 63-86.

1978b "East European Ethnicity in Canadian Society: Recent Trends and Future Implications", paper presented at the Second Conference on Central and East European Studies, Banff, March 2-5, 1978. Proceedings, vol. 3, pp. 1-26.

1978c "Ethnicity and Language in Saskatchewan Schools", paper presented in a Symposium on Ethnicity on the Great Plains, Univ. of Nebraska-Lincoln, Apr. 6-7, 1978.

1978d "The Survival of Ethnolinguistic Minorities: Canadian and Comparative Research", paper presented at the meetings of the International Sociological Assoc. - Research Committee on Sociolinguistics, within the Ninth World Congress of Sociology, Univ. of Uppsala, Sweden, August 14-19, 1978.

1978e "French Settlements in Saskatchewan: Historical and Sociological Perspectives", paper presented at the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Saskatchewan Genealogical Society, Saskatoon, Oct. 20-21, 1978.

1978f "Racism in Toronto", review essay, Canadian Ethnic Studies, vol. x, no. 2, pp. 140-148.

1979a "Ukrainian Ethnicity: Generations and Change in Rural Saskatchewan", and Appendix: "French Ethnicity in North-Central Saskatchewan", in J.L. Elliott (ed.), Two Nations, Many Cultures: Ethnic Groups in Canada. Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall of Canada, pp. 250-269.

1979b (with Leo Driedger), "The Mennonite Family: Culture and Kin in Rural Saskatchewan", in K. Ishwaran (ed.), Canadian Families: Ethnic Variations. Scarborough, Ont.: McGraw-Hill-Ryerson, forthcoming.

Appelt, Jane

1978 "Multiculturalism and Education", a report on the conference of the Canadian Assoc. for Curriculum Studies, held at the Univ. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, in February 1978. Canadian Ethnic Studies, vol. x, no. 1, pp. 132-134.

Berry, John W., Rudolph Kalin, and Donald M. Taylor

1976/77 Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada. Ottawa: Minister of State for Multiculturalism. (Report completed Oct. 1976; published 1977; reviewed in Queen's Alumni Review Nov.-Dec. 1976)

Bonacich, Edna

1972 "A Theory of Ethnic Antagonisms: The Split Labour Market", American Sociological Review, 37 (oct.), pp. 547-559.

Breton, Raymond

1964 "Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants", American Journal of Sociology, LXX, no. 2, Sept. 1964, pp. 193-205.

1974a "Types of Ethnic Diversity in Canadian Society", paper presented at the Eighth World Congress of Sociology, Univ. of Toronto, August 23, 1974.

1974b "Ethnic Pluralism and Social Equality", Human Relations, vol. 4, no. 22, pp. 6-11.

1975 (with Jean Burnet, Norbert Hartmann, W.W. Isajiw, and Jos Lennards) "Research Issues on Canadian Cultures and Ethnic Groups: An Analysis of a Conference", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 12(1), pp. 191-204.

1977 "Variants in Corporate Action Among Ethnic Collectivities" (unpublished mimeograph)

1978 "The Structure of Relationships Between Ethnic Collectivities", in Leo Driedger (ed.), The Canadian Ethnic Mosaic. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, pp. 55-73.

Burnet, Jean

1975 "The Definition of Multiculturalism in a Bilingual Framework", paper presented at the Conference on Multiculturalism and Third World Immigrants in Canada, Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton, Sept. 2-4, 1975.

1978 "The Policy of Multiculturalism Within a Bilingual Framework: A Stock-taking", Canadian Ethnic Studies, vol. X, no. 2, 1978, pp. 107-113.

1979 "Myths and Multiculturalism", paper presented at the annual meetings of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Univ. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, June 6, 1979.

CCCM (Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism)

1975, 77 Reports

Clark, S.D.

1976 "The Canadian Society and the Issue of Multiculturalism", published lecture given at the Univ. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Jan. 27, 1976.

Dahlie, Jorgen

1976 "Ottawa Report: A Note on the Second Biennial Conference of the CCCM" (Conference on "Multiculturalism as State Policy", held in Ottawa, Feb. 13-15, 1975), Canadian Ethnic Studies, vol. VIII, no. 1, pp. 89-93.

Donaldson, Gordon

1979 "Our Costliest Cult", Quest, May.

Driedger, Leo

1973 "Impelled Group Migration: Minority Struggle to Maintain Institutional Completeness", International Migration Review, vol. 7, no. 3 (fall).

1974 "Residential Segregation and Institutional Completeness: A Comparison of Ethnic Minorities" (with Glenn Church as co-author), Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, vol. 11, no. 1, Feb. 1974, pp. 30-52.

1975 "In Search of Cultural Identity Factors: A Comparison of Ethnic Students in Manitoba", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, vol. XII, pp. 150-162.

1976 "Maintainance of Urban Ethnic Boundaries: The French in St-Boniface", paper presented at the annual meetings of the CSAA, Laval University, Quebec, May 26-29, 1976.

1978 "Ukrainian Identity in Winnipeg", in M.L. Kovacs (ed.), Ethnic Canadians: Culture and Education. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, chap. 12, pp. 147-165.

1979 "Ukrainian Identity in Canada: Evidence of Encroaching Assimilation", paper presented at the annual meetings of the CSAA, Univ. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, June 1-4, 1979.

Hawkins, Freda

1972 Canada and Immigration: Public Policy and Public Concern. Montreal: Queen's Univ. Press.

Herman, Harry V.

1979 "Ethnic Diversity and Conflict in Canada", paper presented at the annual meetings of the CSAA, Univ. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, June 1-4, 1979.

Isajiw, Wsevolod W.

1975 "Immigration and Multiculturalism - Old and New Approaches", paper presented at the Conference on Multiculturalism and Third World Immigrants in Canada", Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton, Sept. 3-5, 1975.

1978 "Olga in Wonderland: Ethnicity in a Technological Society", in Leo Driedger (ed.), The Canadian Ethnic Mosaic. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, pp. 29-39.

Islander, October 1, 1974 "Multicultural Council criticized at meeting", pp.1,3.

Islander, January 15, 1974 "Responsible leadership needed now", p.4.

Jansen, Clifford J.

1978 "Community Organization of Italians in Toronto", in Leo Driedger (ed.), The Canadian Ethnic Mosaic. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, pp. 310-326.

Jaworsky, Ivan S.

1977 "Ukrainian Canadians, Multiculturalism, and Separatism: An Assessment", a report on the conference of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton, Sept. 9-11, 1977. Canadian Ethnic Studies, vol. IX, no. 2, pp. 117-119.

Kwavnick, David

1975 "Interest Group Demands and the Federal Political System: Two Canadian Case Studies", in A.Paul Pross (ed.), Pressure Group Behaviour in Canadian Politics. Toronto: McGraw-Hill-Ryerson.

Leone, Laureano

1978 Brief presented by the National Congress of Italian Canadians to the third Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, Ottawa.

Li, Peter

1978 "Institutional Completeness or Institutional Racism: The Case of Chinese in Canada, 1885-1947", paper presented at the annual meetings of the CSAA, Univ. of Western Ontario, London, May-June, 1978.

1979 (with B. Singh Bolaria) "Canadian Immigration Policy and Assimilation Theories", in John Fry (ed.), Economy, Class and Social Reality. Toronto: Butterworths

Loney, Martin

1977 "A Political Economy of Citizen Participation", in L. Panitch (ed.), The Canadian State. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press.

Mahon, Rianne

1977 "Canadian Public Policy: The Unequal Structure of Representation", in L. Panitch (ed.), The Canadian State. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press.

Mallea, J.R. and L.M. Philip

1976 "Canadian Cultural Pluralism and Education - A Selct Bibliography", Canadian Ethnic Studies, vol. VIII, no. 1, pp. 81-88.

Montero, Gloria

1975 "Facing Up to Multiculturalism", Canadian Forum, May 1975, pp. 12-13.

Nahirny, V. and J.A. Fishman

1965 "American Immigrant Groups: Ethnic Identification and the Problem of Generations", Sociological Review, 13, 311-26.

National Advisory Council on Voluntary Action to the Government of Canada (NACVA)

1978 People In Action, Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.

O'Conner, James R.

1973 The Fiscal Crisis of the State. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Palmer, Howard

1975 Immigration and the Rise of Multiculturalism. Toronto: Copp-Clark.

1976 "Reluctant Hosts: Anglo-Canadian Views of Multiculturalism in the Twentieth Century", in Multiculturalism as State Policy (report of the Second Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, Ottawa).

Panitch, Leo

1977 "The Role and Nature of the Canadian State", in L. Panitch (ed.), the Canadian State. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press.

Porter, John

1965 The Vertical Mosaic. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press.

1975 "Ethnic Pluralism in Canadian Perspective", in N. Glazer and D.P. Moynihan (eds.), Ethnicity: Theory and Experience. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, chap. 9, pp. 267-304.

Poulantzas, Nicos

1975 Classes in Contemporary Capitalism. London:

Reich, Michael

1971 "The Economics of Racism", in C.M. Gordon (ed.), Problems in Political Economy: An Urban Perspective. Lexington, Mass.: Heath.

Schermerhorn, R.R.

1970 Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research. New York: Random House.

Smith, A.

1970 "Metaphor and Nationalism in North America", Canadian Historical Review, vol. LI, 1970.

Stasiulis, Daiva K.

1979 "The Representation and Regulation of Ethnic Group Interests Within the Canadian State", paper presented at the annual meetings of the CSAA, Univ. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, June 1-4, 1979.

Van den Berghe, Pierre L. (ed.)

1965 Africa: Social Problems of Change and Conflict. San Francisco: Chandler.

Wolfe, Alan

1977 The Limits to Legitimacy. New York: Free Press.

Yuzyk, Paul

1975 "Canada as a Multicultural Society", paper presented at the Conference on Multiculturalism and Third World Immigrants, Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton, Sept. 3-6, 1975.